

Interview Summary	Application No. 10/072,995	Applicant(s) KOBAYASHI ET AL.	
	Examiner Henry S. Hu	Art Unit 1713	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Henry S. Hu.

(3) Kirsten Grueneberg.

K.G.

(2) David Wu.

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 09 June 2003.

Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☒ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☒ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: all.

Identification of prior art discussed: all.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Applicants have presented a proposed amendment for the 112 rejection and specification objection. An amendment to defend the 102 rejection on Claim 1 regarding the binary initiator system will be submitted by the Applicants.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

HSH
June 9, 2003

David W. Wu

DAVID W. WU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700
Examiner's signature, if required

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.